

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6, and 8-21 are currently pending in the application. Independent claim 21 has been amended. Claim 11 has been amended.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claim 11 is objected to as being of improper dependent form. Applicants have amended claim 11 to depend from claim 4. Therefore, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,401,118 (Thomas).

As defined by independent claim 21, in the present invention, if no input is supplied over a predetermined time period with respect to reference to any of the web sites, the updating section attempts to access each of the addresses contained in an address list and then deletes an address from the address list if the number of times failure has occurred continuously becomes equal to a predetermined threshold value.

Applicants respectfully submit that in contrast to the present invention, Thomas does not disclose the feature of the present invention identified above. In particular, Thomas simply removes a URL when a site's server is down, which is not tantamount to the above-identified feature of the present invention. Therefore, claim 21 is patentable over Thomas, as Thomas does not disclose each and every element of the claim.

On page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6, and 8-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,631,496 B1 (Li) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,401,118 B1 (Thomas).

Li includes a feature by which bookmarks that have not been visited in a specified period of time are automatically deleted and a feature by which "dead bookmarks" are automatically deleted. See Li, FIG. 19.

Thomas includes a feature by which if a site's server is not currently responding, an application removes the URL corresponding to the site from a preliminary set. See Thomas, column 7, lines 31-34.

As defined by independent claim 1, in the present invention, the updating section has a connected line for reference to web sites. If no input is supplied over a predetermined time period with respect to reference to any of the web sites, the updating section attempts to access

each of the addresses contained in an address list and then deletes an address from the address list if the number of times failure has occurred continuously becomes equal to a predetermined threshold value.

Applicants respectfully submit that in contrast to the present invention, Li does not disclose the feature of the present invention identified above. In particular, in Li, if the bookmarks have not been visited within a specified period, they are simply deleted. In contrast, in the present invention, if no input is supplied over a predetermined time period with respect to reference to any of the web sites, an attempt is first made to access each of the addresses contained in the address list. Deletion *may* then occur "if the number of times failure has occurred continuously becomes equal to a predetermined threshold value." Therefore, in contrast to Li, upon determining that no input is supplied over a predetermined time period, the present invention attempts to access each of the addresses first to determine *whether* deletion should occur, as opposed to simply executing the deletion operation as in Li.

As Thomas simply removes a URL when a site's server is down, Thomas adds no relevant information to Li. For example, in Thomas, before removing the URL corresponding to a website from a preliminary set, a "re-try" timer and mechanism is implemented. In contrast to the present invention, the re-try timer in Thomas is directed to time. That is, in Thomas, before removing an address, attempts are made to access the address for a specified amount of time, for example one minute. As used in Thomas, the term "timer" relates to an amount of time. In contrast, in the present invention, as defined by claim 21, for example, an address is removed if a threshold number relating to a number of times access is attempted is met.

Therefore, the combination of Li and Thomas does not teach or suggest the above-identified feature of the present invention.

Hence, independent claims 1, 19, 20, and 21 are patentable over the references. As dependent claims 2-4, 6, and 8-18 depend from independent claim 1, the dependent claims are patentable over the references for at least the reasons presented for the independent claims.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

By: 

Reginald D. Lucas

Registration No. 46,883

Date: 2-27-07

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501